



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/914,309	08/24/2001	Yoichiro Sako	7246/63317	2273
530 7590 10/19/2007 LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			EXAMINER SHERR, CRISTINA O	
			ART UNIT 3621	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/914,309	Applicant(s) SAKO ET AL.	
	Examiner Cristina Owen Sherr	Art Unit 3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 41-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 41-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to applicant's amendment filed April 30, 2007. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Claims 1-5 and 41-52 are currently pending in this case.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed April 30, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues, with respect to claims 1, 4, 41, and 45, that nothing in the cited prior art teaches, discloses or suggests "a transfer of the use history information is induced when the accumulation of uses reaches a preset value."

3. Examiner respectfully disagrees and directs attention to Stefik (US 6,233,684) (Stefik 1) wherein "Auditing. This requirement is for a way to record information on the document about the printing event, such as who owns the print rights, whether photocopying is permitted, and what person or printer printed the document and when the document was printed.

Copy Detection. This requirement is a way for differentiating between printed originals and photocopies. In general, this requirement involves using some print patterns on the page that tend to be distorted by photocopiers and scanners. For some patterns, the difference between copies and printed original is detectable by people; for other patterns, the difference is automatically detectable by a computer with a scanner." (col 10 ln 6-18). Further, "(Work:

(Rights-Language-Version: version-id)

(Work-I D: work-id).sub.opt

(Description: text-description).sub.opt
(Owner: certificate-spec).sub.opt
(Parts: parts-list).sub.opt
(Contents: (From: address) (To: address)).sub.opt
(Copies: copy-count).sub.opt
(Comment: comment-str).sub.opt
rights-group-list)" (appendix A).

4. Thus, while Stefik does not specifically disclose such a transfer, it is obvious and predictable that when a certain number is reached in the "copy count" (the copies that have been paid for, for example), that digital item is some how set aside or transferred to a new list, with the digital items whose rights are now "exhausted."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 4, 41, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stefik et al (US 6,233,684) (Stefik1).

7. Regarding claim 1 –

Stefik1 discloses a digital data processing apparatus (e.g. fig 4) for receiving digital data having a use charged for through one of a data recording medium and a network (e.g. col 9 ln 20-28) and for using the received digital data by employing use permission data

Art Unit: 3621

(e.g. col 9 ln 28-40), comprising: memory means in which use history information of the digital data has been stored, wherein an accumulation of uses of the digital data is represented by the use history information and a transfer of the use history information is induced when the accumulation of uses reaches a preset value (e.g. col 10 ln 6-11, appendix A).

8. Stefik1 does not utilize precisely the same terminology as the instant application, e.g., watermark or "copy count" rather than "use history information", however, mere renaming does not confer patentability. Further, the watermarks and copy count are the functional equivalent of the use history information.

9. Regarding claims 4, 41, and 45 –

Claims 4, 41 and 45 are rejected under the same criteria as above.

10. Claims 2-3, 5, 42-44, 46-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stefik et al (US 6,233,684) (Stefik1) in view of Stefik et al (US 5,629,980) (Stefik2).

11. Regarding the limitation of claim 2 –

Stefik2 discloses wherein after the transfer is induced one of the use of and an operation of the use permission data is disabled during the transfer of the use history information. (e.g. col 23 ln 15-20). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Stefik1 and Stefik2 since they refer to each other in their descriptions.

12. Regarding the limitation of claim 3 –

Art Unit: 3621

Stefik2 discloses wherein the digital data are one of audio data, video data, still image data, character data, computer graphics data, game software, and a computer program (e.g. col 4 ln 29-32), col 6 ln 37-50). As above, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Stefik1 and Stefik2 since they refer to each other in their descriptions.

13. Regarding claims 5, 42-44, and 46-52 –

Claims 5, 42-44, and 46-52 are rejected under the same criteria as above.

14. Examiner's Note: Although Examiner has cited particular columns, line numbers and figures in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant(s), the specified citations are merely representative of the teaching of the prior art that are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim and other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant(s), in preparing the response, fully consider the items of evidence in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

16. Stefik et al (US 5,638,443) disclose a system for controlling the distribution and use of composite digital works.

17. Sims, III (US 6,438,235) discloses media content protection utilizing public key cryptography.

Art Unit: 3621

18. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


19. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cristina Owen Sherr whose telephone number is 571-272-6711. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 Monday through Friday.

21. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew J. Fischer can be reached on 571-272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3621

22. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Cristina Owen Sherr
Patent Examiner, AU 3621


ANDREW J. FISCHER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600